

Attv. Docket: 132071-1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 12 2006

In re Application of:

Mahendra Madhukar Patil

Serial No.: 10/671,147

Filed: September 24, 2003

For: FLUID-DISPENSER DEVICE
CONDUCTIVE TO REDUCED WATER
CONSUMPTION IN A WASHING
MACHINE

Confirmation No.: 4557

Group Art Unit: 1746

Examiner: Stinson, Frankie L.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, on this

date: 09/12/06

Name (Typed/Printed)

Signature:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on September 7, 2006, in which the Examiner issued a restriction requirement. In the Office Action, the Examiner identifies: GROUP I as represented by claims 1-35 said to be drawn to a fluid dispenser, classified in class 134, subclass 17R; and GROUP II as represented by claims 36-45 said to be drawn to a method of delivering a rinse fluid, classified in class 8, subclass 158.

Applicants submit that the Examiner's reasons for grouping the claims as recited does not comport with the recited subject matter of the claims. For example, the Examiner stated "the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process such as one not requiring the jets to have parallel flow with respect to one another". Applicants draw the Examiner's attention to device claim 20 (of GROUP I) and method claim 36 (of GROUP II). Both claims recite that the jets have a "generally

Atty. Docket: 132071-1

Serial no. 10/671,147

Response to Office Action mailed on September 7, 2006

Page 2

parallel relationship". Thus, Applicants submit that claim set 20-35 and claim set 36-45 should be examined together.


Furthermore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is generic to claims 20 and 36. Claim 1 recites "jets having a distinctive exit angle relative to a respective radius..." As recited in paragraphs [029] and [030] of Applicants' specification, such an arrangement encompasses various embodiments where such embodiments allow but do not necessarily require "configuring the jets to have a generally parallel relationship with respect to one another".

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that a restriction requirement in the present application is not proper in the claim 1 is generic to claims 2-45. Failing this, Applicants request that claims 1-19 be grouped together in a first grouping and claims 20-45 be grouped together in a second grouping.

Nevertheless, in order to be compliant with the requirements of 37 C.F.R §1.143, Applicants provisionally elect with traverse to prosecute the claims of Group I (claims 1-35)

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

9/12/06

Jason K. Klindtworth
Reg. No. 47,211

General Electric Company
1 River Road
Building K1, Room 3A65
Niskayuna, New York 12309
Telephone :(518) 387-7360